UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,305	09/16/2003	Joann K. Girard	CE11083JI210	1358

22917 7590 12/26/2007

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER	
KOVACEK, DAVID M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2626	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/26/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com
APT099@motorola.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,305	GIRARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Kovacek	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. **Claims 5**, **13-14**, and **19** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Regarding these claims, each is dependent upon a parent claim that includes a provision to include "all components necessary" for proper operation of an electronic device using a given language pack, yet also includes a limitation that is inherently necessary for proper successful operation of the electronic device.

Claims 5 and **13-14** include a `rules database that includes navigational rules for the at least one language`; **claim 19** recites a similar limitation directed to the general rules in using a language. The examiner contends that navigational rules are an essential feature for proper successful operation of a user interface in any language, and as such are necessarily stored in a manner accessible to the device. Further, any such data structure containing the navigational rules would be appropriately labeled a "rules database." Therefore, such a feature would necessarily be included in the limitation of **claims 3**, and **13-14** as it is considered a "component necessary" for proper successful operation. **Claim 19** is similarly objected to, since any data structure containing the rules of operation for a language

would similarly be labeled a "rules database," and similarly would be necessarily included in the limitations of **claim 19**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claims 3, 12, and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that each fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.

Regarding **claim 3**, the phrase, "all components necessary for the electronic device to use the language supported by the language data package" does not distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention because it is unclear what the inventive entity deems "necessary" for use of the language. Furthermore, the examiner contends that it is an inherent property of any device using a language that the device comprises all components necessary for proper use. Therefore, the examiner contends that **claim 3** is necessarily vague and indefinite because it is unclear what components of such a device would be considered "necessary" for proper operation, but would not be included as an essential feature of the device.

Regarding **claim 12** and **18**, these claims contain similarly phrased omnibus statements and are considered vague and indefinite for the same reasons as applied above to **claim 3**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1-5**, **9, 12**, and **16-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Application 2002/0052910 hereinafter referred to as Bennett.

Regarding **claim 1**, Bennett discloses an electronic device supporting one language, comprising:

- a memory (Fig. 3, elements 24, 54; Page 3, paragraphs 0025-0026) ;
- at least one language data package [resource module] located within the memory having an image file [resource] that contains data on the at least one language (Fig. 1, elements 76, 82; Page 1, paragraph 0007; Page 4, paragraph 0033);

- a pack manager [resource loader], wherein the pack manager is used for loading and unloading the at least one language pack into and out of memory (Page 1, paragraph 0007; Page 2, paragraph 0013; Page 5, paragraph 0041); and
- wherein the at least one language data package can be loaded and accessed by the electronic device without having to perform a system re-boots (Page 4, paragraph 0031-0032).

It is noted by the examiner that the term "re-boot" is directed to a complete re-initialization of system resources, often within the context of a system re-start. The disclosure of Bennett includes the condition of loading data without having to re-initialize all system resources (Page 4, paragraph 0031).

Regarding **claim 2**, Bennett discloses all limitations in **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses additional language data packages may be loaded into the electronic device without recompilation of the electronic device's software (Page 2, paragraphs 0012-0013; Page 4, paragraph 0032).

It is noted by the examiner that though Bennett does not explicitly disclose loading of language data packages without the need for recompilation, this is implied by disclosing the operation of the resource loader after dynamic version checking operations to ensure compatibility in real-time.

Regarding **claim 3**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above, and further discloses the at least one language data package comprises all components necessary for the electronic device to use the language supported by the language data package (Page 1, paragraphs 0006-0007).

Though Bennett does not explicitly teach that all required components for use of a language data package are included, this is implied by the existence of a working system using said language.

Regarding **claim 4**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 3** as applied above, and further discloses the at least one language data package further comprises character font sets to support the at least one language (Page 1, paragraph 0006).

Regarding **claim 5**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 3** as applied above, and further discloses the at least one language data package further comprises a rules database that includes navigational rules for the at least one language (Page 1, paragraph 0006; Page 2, paragraph 0012).

Though this is not explicitly disclosed by Bennett, it is implied in the disclosure of each alternate resource corresponding to a specific interface (Page 2, paragraph 0012),

as each interface will inherently have navigational rules that will conduct operation in response to user input.

Regarding **claim 9**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 1** as applied above and further discloses the electronic device comprises a radio communication device (Page 3, paragraph 0024).

It is noted by the examiner that though Bennett does not explicitly disclose the necessary inclusion of a component device for radio communication, it is inherent (RF transmission) in wireless communication (Page 3, paragraph 0024).

Regarding **claim 12**, Bennett discloses a radio communication device (Page 3, paragraph 0024) supporting at least one language that comprises:

- a memory (Fig. 3, elements 24, 54; Page 3, paragraphs 0025-0026);
- a language data pack [resource module] located within the memory, wherein the language data pack comprises an image file [resource] that contains data on the at least one language (Fig. 1, elements 76, 82; Page 4, paragraph 0033),
- the language data pack further comprising all components necessary for the radio communication device to use the language supported by the language data pack (Page 1, paragraph 0007).

Though Bennett does not explicitly teach that all required components for use of a language data package are included, this is implied by the existence of a working system.

Regarding **claim 13**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 12** as applied above, and further discloses `the language data pack further comprises a rules database which contains rules for using the at least one language` (Page 1, paragraph 0006; Page 2, paragraph 0012).

Though this is not explicitly disclosed by Bennett, it is implied in the disclosure of each alternate resource corresponding to a specific interface (Page 2, paragraph 0012), as each interface will inherently have operational rules that will conduct operation in response to user input.

Regarding **claim 14**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 13** as applied above, and further discloses `the rules database comprises navigational rules for the at least one language` (Page 1, paragraph 0006; Page 2, paragraph 0012).

Though this is not explicitly disclosed by Bennett, it is implied in the disclosure of each alternate resource corresponding to a specific interface (Page 2, paragraph 0012), as each interface will have navigational rules that will conduct operation in response to user input.

Regarding **claim 16**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 12** as applied above, and further discloses the updating of the language data pack does not require reloading of applications found in the radio communication device (Page 2, paragraphs 0012-0013; Page 4, paragraph 0032).

It is noted by the examiner that though Bennett does not explicitly disclose updating of language data without the need for reloading an application, this is inherent in disclosing the operation of the resource loader after dynamic version checking operations to ensure compatibility in real-time.

Regarding **claim 17**, this claim is very similar to **claim 1** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 18**, this claim is very similar to **claim 3** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 19**, this claim is very similar to **claim 5** and is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 7-8**, and **10-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett.

Regarding **claim 7**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 3** as applied above, and further discloses `wherein one of the components in the at least one language data package comprises culture specific information that further comprises character font sets` (Page 1, paragraph 0006).

Bennett only discloses the use of different character font sets, but does not explicitly recite the limitation that these character font sets are related to culture specific information. However, it is well known in the art that different languages have different alphabets, and therefore would require different character font sets to accommodate alternative languages, which is shown to be desirable by Bennett (Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement an electronic device implemented with different character font sets to accommodate different languages.

Regarding **claim 8**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 7** as applied above, and further suggests the inclusion of color schemes [templates in a windowed

environment] as part of the cultural information associated with a data package [resource].

Regarding **claim 10**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 9** as applied above, and further suggests that language data packages can be updated over-the-air in disclosing the operation of the electronic device in a network environment (Fig. 3; Page 3, paragraphs 0028) where resources can be stored upon remote storage locations (Page 3, paragraph 0029). Such a disclosure implies the ability of the device to operate using remote resources available via a network.

Regarding **claim 11**, this claim is very similar to **claim 10**, and is rejected for the same reasons.

It is noted that to one of ordinary skill in the art that the term "tethered" would be synonymous with a computer that allows its resources to be controlled remotely via a network environment such as disclosed by Bennett as applied above to **claim 10**.

5. **Claims 6**, **15**, and **20** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of US Patent Application 2004/0049490 hereinafter referred to as Milov.

Regarding **claim 6**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 5** as applied above, and further suggests that the `at least one language data package comprises key entry rules for text entry` (Page 1, paragraph 0006; Page 2, paragraph 0012). Though this is not explicitly disclosed by Bennett, it is implied in the disclosure of each alternate resource corresponding to a specific interface (Page 2, paragraph 0012), as each interface will have navigational rules that will conduct operation in response to user input.

However, Bennett does not sufficiently disclose support for smart text entry.

Milov discloses the use of smart text entry in an electronic medical database system (Page 5, paragraphs 0074-0077).

The two references are combinable because each teaches a database for storing and making available text-based resources. Milov further provides motivation to combine in disclosing the utility of smart text in increasing the efficiency and accuracy of searching functions in text-oriented databases (Page 2, paragraph 0038; Page 5, paragraph 0075).

Therefore, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Bennett using the teachings of Milov in order to implement a multi-lingual medical database that uses smart text entry in order to increase the efficiency and accuracy of the database search functions.

Regarding **claim 15**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 12** as applied above, but does not disclose the use of a smart text entry database.

Milov discloses the use of smart text entry in an electronic medical database system (Page 5, paragraphs 0074-0077).

The two references are combinable as applied to **claim 5** above, which remains applicable to **claim 15** as each is directed to the use of smart text entry in an electronic database.

Regarding **claim 20**, Bennett discloses all limitations of **claim 17** as applied above, but does not disclose the use of a smart text entry database.

Milov discloses the use of smart text entry in an electronic medical database system (Page 5, paragraphs 0074-0077).

The two references are combinable as applied to **claim 5** above, which remains applicable to **claim 20** as each is directed to the use of smart text entry in an electronic database.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Borgendale (US Patent 4,731,735) teaches a multilingual processor for use in providing a user interface.

- Chong (US Patent 5,175,684) teaches an automatic text translation system.
- Hobson (US Patent 5,694,559) teaches a help system utilizing free text queries.
- Stone (US Patent 5,903,859) teaches a dynamic multi-lingual software module system.
- Vesterinen (US Patent 5,940,790) teaches a multi-lingual interface for a telecommunications device.
- Rettig (US Patent 6,252,589) teaches a multi-lingual operating system interface.
- Lee (US Patent 6,687,736) teaches localization support method for database applications.
- Nova (US Patent Application 2003/0114885) teaches a portable medical device that includes a language-specific interface.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Kovacek whose telephone number is (571) 270-3135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

DMK 12/17/2007